DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 218 CE 079 965

AUTHOR	Corle, Daniel
TITLE	Increased Tutor Participation. Action Research Monograph.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	20p.; In: Action Research Monographs. Complete Set. Pennsylvania Action Research Network, 1998-99. A Section 353 Project of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education. A Learning from Practice Project; see CE 079 962.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Action Research; Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Adult Literacy; *Literacy Education; Participant Satisfaction; *Participation; Professional Development; Questionnaires; *Tutoring; *Tutors; *Volunteer Training; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania; 353 Project

ABSTRACT

This project was developed to increase attendance at inservices and workshops that are provided to continue the training of tutors in the South Pittsburgh office of the Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council (GPLC). A questionnaire was designed and mailed to all (about 20) tutors in the area to obtain input about how prepared they felt, and whether they felt they were receiving enough support and interaction from the organization. Four forms were returned and indicated that: (1) respondents felt positively about the training and felt well-prepared; (2) they gave high marks to the question about usefulness of materials and whether they were receiving enough support from their coordinators and GPLC; (3) they saw the factors of location and time as interferences with workshops; and (4) they felt more prepared at each phase of additional training, involvement in the tutoring, or training process. Students who responded to a questionnaire about their tutors were positive, but these results did not appear to reflect the reality. More aggressive marketing of the workshops included sending updated information about the workshops along with recommendations for specific tutors to attend them. An advanced certificate was offered for all tutors who completed an additional six hours of training. No tutor mentioned an interest in the certificate. Appended are the two questionnaire. (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 218

Action Research Monograph

PENNSYLVANIA ACTION RESEARCH NETWORK
1998-99

Monograph Title:

Increased Tutor Participation

Action Researcher's Name:

Daniel Corle

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

For further project detail contact:
The Pennsylvania Action Research Network
c/o Adult Education Graduate Program
Penn State University, McKeesport Campus
University Drive
McKeesport PA 15132

A Section 353 Project of the
Pennsylvania Department of Education,
Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education

Contact State Literacy Resource Center for Additional copies.

This monograph is a result of a Learning From Practice project developed by The Pennsylvania State University, under support from the U.S. Department of Education, through the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, however, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

CE 079 665

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRODUCT

"Pennsylvania Action Research Network:
Staff Development Through
Six Professional Development Centers"

Project Number 099-99-9010
July 1998-June 1999

Project Director
Dr. Gary Kuhne
Assistant Professor and Regional Director of Adult Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Pennsylvania Action Research Monograph

Note: Action Research is a process of systematic inquiry credited to Kurt Lewin who popularized it in the U.S. in the 1940"s. Today it is considered a system of qualitative research. Typical of action research, none of the individual projects in this monograph series claims to have generalizable application beyond the specific project described. However, each monograph report can serve to be illustrative, instructive and provides the potential for replication in other locations. For a level of generalizability, it is recommended that the reader seek common patterns in the monograph reports in this series, and the wider literature, or contact the Action Research Network for assistance in this.

I. ABSTRACT

I am having problems with low or no attendance of tutors in the South Pittsburgh area at in-services and workshops that are provided to continue the training for our tutors. Along with this problem, I believe that many of our tutors do not feel as if they are a part of our agency and feel disconnected with our overall goals. Often the tutors feel a connection only to their students and their students's goals. I believe that this relates to the lack of participation in GPLC events. Finally, I am concerned with tutor accountability. Because our tutors are volunteers, our agency needs to find ways to require more of them without turning them away. I am concerned that the lack of further training and an overall lack of accountability could be a disservice to the students we are attempting to aid.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council offers ESL, ABE, and GED programs to adult learners in the Greater Pittsburgh area. Trained, volunteer tutors meet with students on a one-to-one or small group setting for a total of 3-4 hours a week. Mostly the meetings are one-to-one and held in local libraries, churches, and other available public facilities. It is a mostly urban and suburban area that is included.

When I began this project in October I had canceled a few in-services for tutors due to a lack of interest. After this project, if I have anyone showing up to any of the in-services, then it will be at least a partial success.

My intervention includes providing more input from tutors, as well as, more contact with the tutors about the in-services being offered. I'm interested in learning how useful they found the in-services to be and why they attended, as well as hearing from those that did not attend to discover problems involving attendance. Part of this will include informing tutors of the in-services that should be of particular interest to them based on my observations and the needs of students. I will begin offering an Advanced Certificate for all tutors who have completed an additional 6 hours of training.

I will be collecting data using questionnaires I have devised and sent to tutors, as well as, another questionnaire sent to students. I will also be using the sign-in sheets we use for our in-services, as well as, a questionnaire on the in-service itself I will also be including some student pre- and post-test scores.

Upon the conclusion of this project I have discovered that my intervention, while

improving slightly, has had very little affect on the involvement of tutors in my area and that I would need to apply additional interventions in order to improve attendance at GPLC in-services and improving the involvement of tutors.

II. PROBLEM

The South Pittsburgh office of Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council includes 12 Pittsburgh area neighborhoods, mostly urban with a few suburban areas. My clientele include students from various backgrounds and ages beginning at age 17. The tutors are also from various backgrounds throughout the area. Presently, I have approximately 35 students and approximately 20 tutors. My role, as coordinator for the office, includes a variety of duties, but I will focus on the areas most directly related to and affecting tutors and the problem at hand. As part of our intake process, I interview all tutors and students in my area and provide information about our program to individuals who call my office. After a tutor finishes our program's 12-hour tutor training sessions I contact the tutor about students they could potentially be matched with. After deciding on the match, I meet with the tutor and go over the materials, forms, and information we have provided. After that, I maintain contact with the tutor, especially during the "probationary period", or first 15 hours, providing support and information. Tutor observations, where I sit in on a session, are conducted on a monthly basis. Throughout the year a minimum of 4 training opportunities are provided in the South Pittsburgh area, not to mention the opportunities in other areas. A newsletter is produced quarterly, providing tutor tips, information on in-services and other GPLC-related activities, and an assortment of other useful information.

The tutors meet with their students in a public place with occasional contact with the agency through phone calls, quarterly newsletter from the coordinator, GPLC events and in-services, and possibly a visit. The tutor is required to send monthly reports to the area coordinator; however, these are not always turned in to the coordinators.

I believe that GPLC could more sufficiently prepare our tutors for lesson planning. As an organization, we could also increase how much we stress the importance of continued training and interaction with other tutors. I'm having problems getting tutors to attend workshops that our program holds to assist tutors with further training. Since joining Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council, as part of my duties, I have been arranging for tutor trainings to be made available to

tutors in my area. Despite holding these trainings at various times throughout the day and the week, I have had very little response to them. In fact, I have been forced to cancel a majority of them due to lack of interest, i.e. no one had called to register for them. Unfortunately, this problem was most likely exacerbated by the change in office location and lack of answering service for many months. I have been forced to relocate my office once again during this project which has also had a stultifying impact on the performance of my interventions. Part of the problem created was that I was unsure of what spaces would be available for my use.

Finally, I believe that our agency could do more to offer the tutors opportunities to evaluate our program's effectiveness and level of support. The only feedback we receive from tutors is on the monthly reports, which doesn't allow for much critical feedback.

I believe that improving the attendance of tutors at in-services and other GPLC-related events would have two positive effects. First, I believe that more area tutors would continue tutoring for a longer period of time with our agency and feel more positively about their involvement in our agencies program. Second, I believe that the improved attendance would result in improved tutoring skills and therefore result in more fruitful tutoring sessions and greater improvement of our students' skills. This would possibly increase student test scores, retention, and provide more opportunities for program improvement through a greater understanding of our tutors' needs.

III. PLANNING

First, I created and mailed an evaluation form to all tutors in my area, asking them to complete the form. This evaluation was mailed for both an interim and final data collection process, as well as informational for the continued progress of my action research.

Second, I also contacted students over the phone and asked them to complete an evaluation. Like the tutor evaluation form, this had both an interim and final data collection process involving the contact of both new and old students.

Third, I engaged in a more aggressive marketing of the workshops being offered. I sent updated information about the workshops along with recommendations for specific tutors to attend.

Fourth, I offered an Advanced Certificate for all tutors who completed an additional 6

hours of training.

I considered it a success if 20% of my area tutors had attended each in-service. This percentage would have required 4 tutors to attend each in-service. I also wanted to have a minimum of one tutor receive an Advanced Certificate. I also considered it a success if 50% of the tutors in my area had responded to questionnaires and if they increased the rating of how connected they felt to our agency was raised by a point.

I mailed the tutor evaluations at the beginning of October and began contacting students at the beginning of November. Tutors received a mailing about the Advanced Certificate in the mail. along with more information about workshops in November. I engaged in an interim evaluation of the progress of my action research in January and concluded the research in April.

I needed staff support to help me create the Advanced Certificate, as well as for the trainings and workshops. I needed additional materials to offer my tutors for their lessons.

The data I collected includes: Tutor Evaluations, Student Evaluations, Student Test Scores, Workshop Attendance, and conversations with students and tutors.

I compared the data collected through the above methods during the time of the interventions with the data collected prior to the enactment of the interventions. I based my success on the improvement of the above specified criteria.

There were a few problems which interfered with my interventions. The continued difficulty for tutors to reach me, due to the continued changes in my office environment. The time and distance constraints that tutors had to overcome in order to increase their participation. A general lack of participation from tutors and students.

I attempted to overcome the time and distance constraints of my tutors by attempting to tailor the time and location of workshops to those which would most likely suit my tutors based on the available information including where they work and live and the times they have designated as open for tutoring. I also increased the time I spend in contact with tutor, both initially and afterwards, and more heavily stressed the importance of workshops attendance.

When I first began this research I was unaware of any literature on this issue, but since that time I have found some related literature. For one, my supervisor was involved in a PALPIN project dealing with volunteer retention. I also came across and article by Steve McCurley about a number of issues dealing with volunteers. Neither of these specifically dealt with the problem in

my action research, but each discussed some issues that are related and are helpful in considering other interventions for the future.

My problem statement is: "Will the implementation of a more aggressive marketing campaign, including an opportunity for Advanced Certification, in an Adult Education program improve tutor attendance at in-services to 20% and increase the interaction between tutors over a 6 month period?"

IV. ACTION

I was holding an in-service in December on Conquering GED Math Anxiety, so I concentrated my efforts on directing tutors to this in-service. I began by sending a letter about the in-service, while also including information on two other GPLC in-services in my winter edition of the quarterly newsletter I send to all my tutors. In this letter, I also informed all my tutors that I would now be supplying Advanced Tutor Certificates to all tutors who attended 6 hours of additional trainings. For tutors whom I felt this in-service would be particularly beneficial to, I made a special note on the letter that I believed they should register for this particular in-service. After sending out the mailings, I began to make phone calls to tutors, sometimes leaving messages and other times speaking with them directly. The in-service was held on a Saturday at my office in the South Side. The week of the in-service I had three tutors registered, but only one showed up. Although I was disappointed with the turn-out, I was happy that at least one person showed up.

The next in-service I held in my area was in February. This in-service dealt with teaching reading comprehension strategies and was also held on a Saturday. In January I sent out my quarterly newsletter. In this newsletter I highlighted the in-services that would be held in my area in the next few months. Once again I sent mailings to my tutors to remind them of the in-service followed by phone calls. I had three possible tutors from my area and one tutor from another coordinator\"s area registered to attend. One of my tutors arrived along with the tutor from the East End. Again it might be said that I improved attendance, increasing to two tutors, and that at least I didn't need to cancel the in-service, but I still wasn't satisfied with the results.

The next in-service was the one I was most interested in because it was an opportunity for tutors to meet with each other and discuss some of their challenges and successes. Unfortunately, this was held in the beginning of March, which was during the time when my previous office

space was undergoing a chaotic transitional period. The Welfare office had taken over the lease for the building I was located in and no one was doing much to include our organization in the planning or even in providing us with information about what was to happen to our office space. This prevented me from supplying the kind of effort I had made for the last two in-services and I was forced to cancel it.

Finally, I had moved to my new office on April 1st and hoped to have tutors attend a tutor talk/open house. Keeping this in mind I included in my spring newsletter a set of times that I would be holding an open house/tutor talk. I wasn't able to send out the newsletter until the week before the set dates, but I hoped that by giving three dates I would be offering enough flexibility to the tutors to attend one of them or to at least receive some responses about why the could not come. I had a Friday afternoon, a Sunday morning and a Monday evening set aside for tutors and their students to come to my new office space. Unfortunately, no one appeared to be interested and I was once again forced to cancel.

This intervention began in October and continued through the middle of April. Unfortunately it was interrupted throughout the entire month of March due to difficulties with my previous office space and time spent locating my current office space.

Another important constraint that I haven't mentioned yet is the restraint on myself to hold in-services at certain times. I believe that tutors are probably most likely to attend in-services in the evenings through the week, but this was not an option I generally had available to me. I was constrained by the fact that I had no free evenings through the week to hold any in-services and therefore I am uncertain as to whether or not this might have been a time more convenient to my tutors. This brings me to question whether or not we might be able to schedule in-services for our tutors without requiring ourselves, as coordinators, to be there, Perhaps, as long as some member of staff is there to facilitate and it is held in our area, I might have had more success scheduling in-services with a higher attendance rate.

V. RESULTS

The first group of data to be summarized was an evaluation form I sent to all the tutors in my area. I have included a copy of the form for reference. This form was devised to get input from tutors about how prepared they felt and if they felt that they were receiving enough support and

interaction from myself and our organization. This form was devised to take very little time and to be very easy to follow, while still providing me with sufficient information about the tutor and our program. I used 10 question; three of which were open-ended and seven which used a scale of 1-10 which the respondents could answer by simply circling a number. Unfortunately, I only received four forms. The small number of respondents is a clear indicator of the problems of tutor involvement. The other important part of this evaluation was that it was anonymous. I felt that this would be important to ensure honest answers. But the anonymity prevented me from pursuing tutors to complete the form. Unlike the form I used with students, I was unable to call tutors to insure that they respond.

I labeled the forms: A, B, C, D, and E (which came in while I was revising the paper) and will be referring to the tutors by the letter I used to label each form.

Question	Tutor A	Tutor B	Tutor C	Tutor D	Tutor E	Average
#2	8	6	10	7	10	8.2
#3	8	8	10	8	10	8.8
#4	9	9	10	6		8.5
#6	9	8	10	10	10	9.2
#7	9	9		9	10	9.25
#8		6	1	9	10	6.5
#10			10	7	10	9

The first question was open-ended question the Tutor Training and it appears that tutors felt positively about the training except for tutor D's doubts about the ability to apply it and tutor A's apprehension about math. Tutor B responded that the ESL training wasn't as satisfying. Tutor E mentioned feeling exhilarated and hopeful.

The second question asked how well prepared each tutor felt after the training. Overall, it appears that tutors feel well-prepared on a scale of 1-10. Tutor D was the one who felt that the information was excellent, but doubted herself as a tutor. In fact, in times I spoke with her, she questioned her own ability in working with her student and wondered if her student might do better with someone else. Tutor B appears to have included both ESL and Basic tutor trainings in her evaluation.

The third question was very helpful. It asked the tutors how well prepared they each felt after meeting with their coordinator. The three high scores remained the same and the two low scores moved up. Two scores were tens to begin with, so only a downward trend would be noteworthy, but what I think is important is that both tutors who felt slightly less comfortable, raised their feeling of comfort to an 8 after meeting with the coordinator. I believe this shows that the initial meeting with the coordinator is very important, particularly to tutors who are feeling apprehensive or overwhelmed by the workshop.

The fourth question asked how each tutor felt after meeting their respective students for the first time. Again the trend was generally upward, though the average remained at an 8.5 due to Tutor D now showing a new low of a 6 on the comfort scale. I believe that the reason for Tutor D's sharp decline was due to the fact that this tutor was working with a low-level student who very likely has learning problems, resulting in her frustration. In fact, I have spoken with this tutor about contacting Dr. Cooper and attending workshops on LD. The tutor has mentioned the need for more training in that area in the next question.

Question five is the second open-ended question, asking about the areas that each tutor feels the need for more training. Tutor A said nothing even though this tutor has attended a workshop on reading comprehension and is signed up to attend one on math. Tutor B wanted more training on grammar. Tutor C didn't answer this question and Tutor D wanted more LD training, despite having attended one in-service on LD already. Tutor E indicated none needed.

Question six asked about the usefulness of the materials. All the tutors gave high marks on this question. Therefore, we should feel pretty secure with the types of materials we are providing and the time spent with the tutors reviewing them.

Question seven also received high marks. This question asked the tutors if they were receiving enough support from their coordinators and GPLC.

Question eight was probably the most interesting question on the form. It asks how much each tutor feels a part of the GPLC organization. Tutor C responded that our organization doesn't use her enough in our trainings and activities. I felt this was very interesting though considering the high rating from question seven about the amount of support tutors receive from the agency. It is also interesting considering all of the tutors who responded, except Tutor B and Tutor E (this tutor is brand new and wouldn't\' have had the opportunity) have attended at least one in-service.

Question nine asks which workshops each tutor has attended as well as asking why they have attended workshops or why not. The largest interference seemed to be location, though time was also important and how other commitments infringed upon that time.

Question ten asks how prepared each tutor felt after the workshop. At the time of this questionnaire only two had attended workshops: Tutors B and D. Tutor C remained at a 10, while Tutor D moved back up to how she felt immediately following the initial tutor training.

Each of these tutors sends in their tutor monthly reports regularly, which is not very common among other tutors and can most likely explain why they responded to the questionnaire. Each has received a varying amount of contact from me ranging from little: Tutor C; moderate: Tutors A and B; and frequent: Tutors D and E. A lot of this is due to Tutor D's frustrations with her student, requiring constant contact.

An important finding in this survey is that generally at each phase of additional training or involvement in the tutoring or training process, the tutors feel more prepared. After the tutor training the tutors generally raised their feeling of preparedness after meeting with the coordinator, meeting their student, and/or attending an additional training. The only time there was a decline was with Tutor D upon meeting the low-level student with learning problems, but even this decreased score was countered by an increased score after additional training.

At the end of the questionnaire, I opened up the opportunity for additional comments. Tutor E wrote that all the trainers did an excellent job and that the coordinator let him know that he could count on continued support whenever needed. The tutor also mentioned that he is glad to be a part of an excellent program.

I also did a questionnaire with students about their tutors. Overall, the students responded positively about their tutors, but to the point that it doesn't seem reflective of the reality. This could be because the students don't really know what should be expected of their tutoring sessions. Another reason might be that the students are concerned that either this information will get back to the tutor or that their answers might cost them their tutor. The first assumption could be based on the belief that I might reprimand or question the tutor who doesn't receive high marks from their student and that the tutor will assume that this was the result of student complaints. The second fear might be aggravated by the fact that some of my students have waited a considerable amount of time for their tutor and are afraid, not only of losing their tutor, but also waiting a long time for

another match.

Since we are dealing with literacy students, I decided that it would be best for me to complete the questionnaire via phone interviews, rather than by sending them through the mail. Although this prevents anonymity, it was more successful at pooling a larger number of respondents.

Two of the students who completed the questionnaire are matched with tutors who returned the evaluation form. In all, eight students completed the questionnaire. Students A and D correspond to Tutors A and D, while all others did not have tutors who also filled out questionnaires.

The first question asked if the student and tutor met regularly. Every student answered this affirmatively, despite the fact that I know this was not always true.

Question	A	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Average
#2	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	9.6
#3	10	8	10	10	9	10	10	10	9.6
#4	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	9.8
#5	8	7	10	10	10	8	10	10	9.1
#6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
#7	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	9.7
#8	2	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	8.5
#9	10	6	10	8	10	10	10	10	9.2
#11	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	9.7

In all the other questions, all six of the students who did not have a tutor who also completed a questionnaire gave 10's except for one 9 on the question about being taught lessons that the student wants to learn and an 8 on receiving encouragement from their tutor. The two students whose tutors also responded to a questionnaire had a little more variety in their responses. The student matched with Tutor A also gave the tutor a 10 on how well prepared the tutor was, despite the tutor giving an 8 on the corresponding question on the tutor questionnaire. The student matched with Tutor D gave a 7 on this question, which matched up with the score given by the tutor on the tutor questionnaire. The student matched with Tutor A mostly fell in line with the responses given by the other students except for a few times. On question five a score of 8 was

given on whether or not the lessons were too difficult or too hard. This is still a high score, but the fact that the student didn't give the same number for each question makes all the other answers a little more believable. This student gave a 2 on question eight, asking how often a tutor uses a variety of activities. Despite a low score on something I believe would be influential on the other answers, all other scores were a 10. I would've thought that a low score on this question would mean that the lessons were boring or not always reflective of the learning strengths of the student, thereby making the lessons too difficult. In fact, maybe that is why the score was lowered to an eight on that question.

The student matched with Tutor D had even more variety in the responses to the questions. I already mentioned the answer to question two, so I'll begin with the score on lessons being on subjects that the student wanted to learn which was an 8. Question four asked if the lessons were on things the student believed were subjects that needed to be learned. This was scored a 9. The fifth question, whether the lessons were too hard or too easy was rated a 7. The tutor received a 10 on encouragement in question six. Question seven, how comfortable do you feel with the tutor and the location received an 8. Question eight, how often does your tutor use a variety of activities in the lesson and question nine, how often do you ask your tutor for clarification when you don't understand both received scores of 6. Question ten, in what areas could the tutor better serve you, elicited a response about making the topics more interesting. Finally, the final question about how much support is given by the coordinator and the agency was scored an 8. The student matched with Tutor D seemed to respond less diplomatically than the other students, but even these responses seem a little high given the circumstances.

I included information on the four students who were post-tested in the program. The students with Tutors A and D improved their test scores by an average of 2.7 compared to the other two students average of 2.1. If these results were found to be true throughout the program, then I believe this would give more impetus to requiring tutors to attend in-services and could be used as a tool to convince tutors to attend.

		Pre-test	Post-test
Student A	Verbal	5.5	8.2
	Comp	7	9.3
Student D	Verbal	6	9.3
	Comp	0	2.5
No Survey	Verbal	6.8	5.8
	Comp	6.7	PHS
Student J	Verbal	8	9.4
	Comp	10.1	PHS

I have also collected some information from tutors and records of the time spent with individual tutors. Of the four tutors that have attended in-services in the past year, all have continued to tutor for our agency. In that same period of time, I have had 8 tutors leave my area. One tutor that attended an in-service wrote on a monthly progress report that the in-service that was attended was found to be very useful and that a math in-service would be appreciated.

VI. REFLECTION

Looking back at the in-services I held in my area in the past year I can see how the interventions worked, but there are even more questions that have been raised and more ways I need to approach my problem. Before I began this project, I was forced to cancel my previous four in-services. After I began this project, I was able to hold two in-services for my tutors and cancel two of my in-services. The two in-services I was able to hold were ones that received more of my attention and effort, including letters and follow-up phone calls. The two in-services I was forced to cancel did not receive the same kind of attention and therefore had less of a chance for success. This shows me that more contact with the tutors about the in-services will indeed improve attendance.

The question left unanswered is how much contact is required for tutors to attend. I have not had a single tutor mention an interest in the Advanced Tutor Certificate I offered which leads me to believe that it was not effective. It would have been nice if I had thought to include something about the Certificate in one of my questionnaires. Finally, due to the fact that I had a very low attendance rate, I obviously need to look into other ways to bring tutors into my in-services. The results of this project show that the less prepared a tutor feels, the more support they need from our organization from both coordinator contact and available in-services. One thing that should be instituted is a mini-questionnaire used by coordinators at the end of their initial contact

with the tutor to discover their comfort level and/or a follow-up to that after they have met with their student initially. As an agency, we need to look into any way we might increase contact between the tutors and our agency. I also believe that we need to explain the importance of continued training to our tutors.

One of the things that I thought was interesting to note was that the two students whose tutors also responded to a questionnaire seemed more inclined to deviate from scoring a 10 on everything. I still wonder if this had to due with the actual tutoring or if they were more honest and careful.

Some important lessons can be learned from the information on Tutor D and the student. Although, as coordinators we often feel desperate to match students, we need to be more aware of the needs of our students and the skill level of our tutors. I realize now that a student with learning problems should only be matched with an experienced tutor who has been to LD in\-services.

There are some things, as a coordinator, that I might be able to implement to help solve my problem. I could institute a required re-training period for my tutors, perhaps every 6 months. If a tutor did not further their training within that time, they could be placed as temporarily inactive until they had attended an additional training. I believe this would require approval from my supervisor. I also believe that a yearly schedule would be useful. It might be better for tutors to see the opportunities for them throughout the year so that they could better plan for which ones they would like to attend. Sometimes tutors have told me that they put off attending an in-service because they assumed that it would be offered again and that the next offering might be more convenient. This would be particularly useful, in the long run, if this schedule was used each year. This doesn't mean the in-services remain the same yearly, but that the times remain the same. I also think that I should have reviewed the in-service schedule with new tutors upon our first meeting and taken time to discuss the upcoming events with them, in particular if they might be useful to the student they are matched with.

Some institutional changes are perhaps more in order to deal with the problems I have been facing, rather than relying on my ability to pull in tutors for events. As an agency, we should look at requiring a tutor to attend an in-service after meeting with the student for 50 hours, to correspond with the post-testing of the student. Also, we might want to speak with a tutor about a possible match, while discussing some of the relevant in-services that must be taken in order to be

matched with this particular student.

I have found that my interventions have lead to the collection of some useful information and some ideas that could be used to motivate tutors to attend more in-services.

Evaluation Form

Date: Coordinator:

1. How did you feel after the Tutor Training Workshop? _____

2. How well prepared to tutor did you feel?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
3. How prepared did you feel after you met with your coordinator?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
4. How did you feel after you met with your student a few times?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
5. In what areas did you not feel fully prepared or would have liked more training?_
6. How useful did you feel the materials (books, etc.) you received were?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
7. Do you receive enough support from your coordinator/GPLC?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
8. Do you feel like a part of the GPLC organization?
   (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)
9. Have you attended any of the workshops or events hosted or sponsored by GPLC? Which ones? Why or why not?_____
10. How prepared did you feel after attending the workshop?
    (not very) **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10** (very)

Please use the back if you need more space to answer a question or to make any additional comments.

Tutor Update Form

Date: Tutor:

Tutoring Location: Student:

1. Do you meet regularly with your tutor? Why or why not?_____

2. Your tutor seems prepared?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
3. The lessons are on things that you want to learn?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
4. The lessons are on things that you need to learn?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
5. The lessons are not too difficult or too easy?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
6. Your tutor gives you encouragement throughout the lesson?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
7. How comfortable do you feel with your tutor and the location?
   (not very) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (very)
8. Your tutor uses a variety of activities in the lessons?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
9. You ask questions when you don't entirely understand your tutor?
   (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)
10. In what areas could your tutor serve you better?_____

11. You are gettting enough support from your coordinator and GPLC?
    (rarely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (always)